



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/177,960	10/23/1998	IRENE MAUROMMATI	PHN16576	3771
24737	7590	03/03/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			LUU, SY D	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2174	16

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/177,960	MAUROMMATI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sy D Luu	2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the RCE and Amendment C, filed 12/22/03.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 5 are independent claims.
This action is made Non-Final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steele et al. (“Steele”, US # 5,742,779) in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (“IBM TDB”, Vol. 35, Issue 4B, pp. 227-232; Sept. 1992) and Beaudet et al. (“Beaudet”, US 5,689,668).

As per claim 1, Steele teaches an information processing system comprising: a display; a processor that is configured to display a first sequence of first icons in a first field on the display and repeatedly make the currently displayed first icon selectable (fig. 7A, *icons such as actors and things which belong to the parent “TOLFA” on the hierarchy*), and selecting means, arranged for selecting the selectable first icon, wherein upon selection of the selectable first icon, the processor is further configured to continue displaying the currently displayed and selected first icon, and display in a second field (fig. 7B) on the display a second sequence of second icons (fig. 7B, *icons such as home and hospital which belong to the parent “things” on the hierarchy*), and repeatedly make the currently displayed second icon selectable, and the selecting

means is further arranged for selecting the selectable second icon (col. 12, line 66 – col. 13, line 20).

Steele fails to teach the displaying of a sequence of icons in a timed loop and repeatedly making the currently displayed icon selectable to be applicable to both the first and second sequence of icons. This is what the IBM TDB teaches (pages 227-229; figs 1-2). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the IBM TDB's teaching with the system of Steele in order to provide a more compact presentation resulting in a more efficient use of screen real estate.

Although Steele teaches the step of continuing to display the currently displayed and selected first icon of the first field (fig. 7B; "things" icon being displayed at the top left), Steele does not show that the selected first icon to be displayed in the first field. Steele further does not explicitly teach: the second field on the display that is distinct from the first field, and repeatedly making the currently displayed icon selectable to be applicable to both the first and second sequence of icons.

Beaudet teaches a dynamic hierarchical selection menu, wherein multiple field levels are displayed simultaneously and distinct from each other (abstract; fig. 1). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Beaudet's teaching with Steele's method in order to provide users with a more comprehensive view of all levels during navigation.

As per claims 2-4, as already addressed in previous paragraphs, the system of Steele and IBM TDB teaches the processing means to be arranged for displaying, upon selection of the selectable first or second icon, an information item in an output field on the display that is

Art Unit: 2174

distinct from the first field; the step of terminating a timed loop while continuing to display the currently displayed and selected icon, wherein the information item comprises a sequence of information sub-items in a timed loop (Steele: figs 7A and 7B; col. 12, line 66 – col. 13, line 20; and IBM TDB: page 1, paragraphs 1-3 after the citation header; figs 1-2).

Claims 5-8 are similar in scope to claims 1-4 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 9-10 are similar in scope to claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11-13 are similar in scope to claims 2-4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 14, the method of Steele, IBM TDB and Beaudet teaches each of the first and second fields of the display has a size that is independent of a quantity of icons in each of the first and second sets of icons, thereby allowing each icon of each of the first and second sets of icons to be sized independent of the quantity of icons in each of the first and second sets of icons (IBM TDB; figs. 1-2; “*Dynicon*” where each field of the sets of icons would be sized to hold only one icon regardless of the quantity of icons in each of the sets).

Claims 15-16 are similar in scope to claims 2-4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 17-20 are similar in scope to claims 1-4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sy Luu whose telephone number is **(703) 305-0409**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 7:00 am to 4:30 pm (EST). The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



SY D. LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER